REMARKS

The specification has been amended. Claim 5 has been amended. New claim 9 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Reconsideration and reexamination is respectfully requested.

In the specification, the title has been amended. The field of invention section and the summary section have been deleted.

In paper 3, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,700,607 (Misawa *et al.*). Applicant has amended claim 5 to specify contiguous blocks. In addition, new claim 9 has been added. Support for the amendment, and support for new claim 9, may be found, for example, in figures 3A and 3B.

In paper 3, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,196,939 (Elabd *et al.*). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 7 specifies that a block is transferred until the shift register is filled with charges from the block. In Eladb *et al.*, the shift registers are never filled. For example, in claim 15, cited by the examiner, each even storage position of the first transfer register is an empty site, and each odd storage position of the second transfer register is an empty site.

In paper 3, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 4,974,093 (Murayama), in light of Elabd *et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 specifies that charges from a block of photosensors, from more than one exposure, are multiplexed onto one charge shift register. Murayama and Elabd *et al.*, individually or combined, do not teach or suggest that charges from a block of photosensors, from more than one exposure, are multiplexed onto one charge shift register. Murayama does not teach or suggest multiplexing charges from more than one exposure onto one charge shift register. In Murayama, charges from one exposure go to a first shift register (both vertical and horizontal), charges from a second exposure go to a second shift register (both vertical and horizontal), and there never is a case where charges from two exposures are multiplexed onto one charge shift register. The examiner cites Elabd *et al.*, column 7, lines 18-38. In the cited text, two odd charges from one row, or two even

charges from one row, may be added together in the horizontal transfer register, but this has nothing to do with multiplexing different blocks onto one register. Accordingly, a combination of Murayama and Elabd *et al.*, does not teach or suggest multiplexing different blocks onto one register.

The following comments are in regard to other art made of record by the examiner. U.S. Patent Numbers 5,541,654, 5,861,917, 5,995,249, and 6,459,077 do not teach or suggest charges from a block of photosensors, from more than one exposure, are multiplexed onto one charge shift register, as specified in claim 1. U.S. Patent Numbers 5,541,654, 5,861,917, 5,995,249, and 6,459,077 do not teach or suggest multiplexing contiguous blocks from more than one array of photosensors onto one charge shift register, as specified in claim 5. U.S. Patent Numbers 5,541,654, 5,861,917, 5,995,249, and 6,459,077 do not teach or suggest filling a charge shift register with charges only from a block of photosensors, as specified in claim 7.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. This application is considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by A. W. Winfield

Augustus W. Winfield

Reg. No. 34,046

September 14, 2004

Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

(970)-898-3142